

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis on Kimlinger, et al. and Comerford, et al. The independent claims have been amended to include the subject matter of cancelled claim 4, with some modifications, as supported, for example, in Fig. 5. Applicant traverse the rejections of claims 1-13 because the cited references do not disclose or suggest exerting exclusive control over plural application programs, as in the independent claims as amended.

On page 3 of the office action, the examiner apparently recognizes that this feature of the present invention is not found in the references, but notes that the feature was not clearly claimed. With the present amendment, applicant submits that the previous arguments have merit in light of the present claim amendments, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call Applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Patrick G. Burns
Registration No. 29,367

Customer No. 24978

June 2, 2006

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
P:\DOCS\1503\65307\AB2955.DOC